## REMARKS

Claims 2-3 and 5-7 are pending in this application, of which claim 7 has been withdrawn from consideration and claims 2 and 6 have been amended. Claim 4 has been canceled. No new claims have been added.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for showing item 30 which is not mentioned in the description. Fig. 2 shows "item 30", which has been changed to "130" in the corrected print of Fig. 2 attached hereto.

If approved, this correction will be incorporated into formal drawings to be filed prior to payment of the Issue Fee.

Claims 2-3 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,663,611 to Seats et al. (hereinafter "**Seats et al.**") in view of U.S. Patent 5,957,743 to Konishi et al. (hereinafter "**Konishi et al.**").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As noted in Applicants' response of December 27, 2002, **Seats et al.** discloses a multi-color display having a matrix of cells containing an ionizable gas and fluorescent layers (18) that fluoresce with different colors. The display has rows of cathodes (21) and anodes (20) one of each of which is exposed within each cell so that individual cells can be energized. Each cathode (21) has at least one field-emitter (23) which may be either an uncoated cone, a cone coated with a material with a negative electron affinity, such as a diamond film (27), or formed with a negative electron affinity material, such as diamond. Cells may include an aluminum layer (17) and a dielectric layer (16) for reflecting UV and VUV radiation.

**Konishi et al.** discloses a color plasma display panel in which a phosphor coat is formed all over a panel by introducing a step to coat the whole surface of a luminescent display section with a paste containing white particulates of titanium oxide 10 or the like, which are finer than phosphor powder, after barriers are formed on a back substrate and before the discharge cell inside is sequentially coated with phosphors for different colors to make up luminescent pixels. By applying the particulate paste to the unfired barrier portion, which is then in a very porous state, before the phosphor coating stage, collective firing of the barriers and the phosphor layers is made possible.

The Examiner has urged that the titanium oxide layer 10 corresponds to the reflective surface of the instant application.

Even if, arguendo, this is true, the titanium oxide does not constitute metal plating which reflects all wavelengths of at least visible light and electromagnetic energy away from said back surface glass plate, as in the present invention.

Accordingly, claim 2 has been amended to recite this distinction.

Thus, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over **Seats et al.** and **Konishi et al.** in view of Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "**APA**").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

**APA** fails to teach, mention or suggest the limitations added to claim 2 discussed above, from which claim 3 depends.

Thus, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over **Seats et al.** and **Konishi et al.** in view of U.S. Patent 6,051,928 to Choi et al. (hereinafter "**Choi et al.**").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

**Choi et al.** has been cited for teaching that the surface of the first surface glass plate is not a reflection surface, but fails to teach, mention or suggest the limitations of claim 2, from which claim 3 depends.

Thus, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over **Seats et al.** in view of U.S. Patent 5,182,489 to Sano (hereinafter "**Sano**").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

**Sano** has been cited for teaching a surface of the back surface glass plate opposite and facing the display surface in a reflection surface.

**Sano** fails to teach, mention or suggest that reflector 30 shown in Fig. 5 is metal plating which reflects all wavelengths of at least visible light and electromagnetic energy away from said back surface glass plate, as recited in the proposed amendments to claim 2, from which claim 5 depends.

Thus, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over **Seats et al.** in view of **Sano** and **APA**.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As noted above, all these references fail to teach, mention or suggest the limitations added to claim 2, from which claim 3 depends.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over **Seats et al.** in view of **Sano** and **Choi et al**.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As noted above, none of these references teaches, mentions or suggests the limitations added to claim 2, from which claim 3 depends.

Thus, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over **Sano** in view of JP Publication 10-293541 to Ookara et al. (hereinafter "**Ookara et al.**").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

**Ookara et al.** has been cited for teaching a display module having electronics mounted to the back surface thereof but, like **Sano**, fails to teach, mention or suggest the limitations added to claim 2, as attached hereto.

Thus, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has indicated that claim 6 would be allowed if amended to be in independent form.

Accordingly, claim 6 has been so amended.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 2-3 and 5-6, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP

William L. Brooks
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/mla
Atty. Docket No. **001215**
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930

23850
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosures: Request for Approval of Drawing Corrections w/ Fig 2 marked in red ink

H:\HOME\letitia\WLB\00\001215\response may 2003